

# A Brief History of The One-Cup and Non-Sunday School Movement



**January 4, 1999**

Like any growth, development may be healthy or it may be malignant; discerning the difference between these two kinds of growth requires constant research into the pathology of traditions. But it is healthy development that keeps a tradition both out of the cancer ward and out of the fossil museum.[\[1\]](#)

## INTRODUCTION

A brief history of the one-cup and non-Sunday school movement is essential to a proper understanding of this wing of the American Restoration Movement in the United States with its emphasis upon the common cup in the Lord's Supper and no Bible study classes. This particular segment of the Restoration Movement maintains that it alone is the *true* church of Christ. According to this fellowship of believers, unless a congregation uses one common drinking vessel in the distribution of the fruit of the vine and rejects the modern day Bible study class method of teaching, then one cannot be a *true* child of God or a *true* church. This group of Christians firmly believes that it is maintaining doctrinal purity. This body of believers also maintains that "We speak where the Bible speaks, and we are silent where the Bible is silent." Yet, the one-cup movement is still hopelessly divided into many warring factions—each claiming the motto for its own.[\[2\]](#)

A short record of the one-cup campaign within the Churches of Christ sheds light on the philosophy of this viable movement.[\[3\]](#) This branch of the Stone-Campbell movement desires to adhere to the teachings of God as revealed in the New Testament books. This movement is by no means dead. It is very much alive and growing on Planet Earth. Since I am acquainted with many of its major players, it is appropriate that I preserve an epitomized account about this one-cup and non-Sunday school story. This writer knew many of the second-generation advocates of this once very fashionable theory.[\[4\]](#) This distinct doctrine of one-cup and non-Sunday school emphasis is founded, as stated above, upon the principle that "We speak where the Bible speaks, and we are silent where the Bible is silent."[\[5\]](#)

## REFORMATION OBJECTIVES

## INSIDE AND OUTSIDE THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST

It is not uncommon for Christians within the Churches of Christ to forget that there have been a number of "restoration movements" within the Christian community. Perhaps, it would assist Christians in comprehending their own movement if they perceived the dominant point(s) of other restoration movements. For example, Luther's (1483-1546) reformation concentrated upon the forgiveness of sins, not forms or rituals. His biblical "pattern" was grace through Jesus, not works.<sup>[6]</sup> Luther wanted to restore the gospel message of divine grace. On the other hand, John Wesley (1703-91) sought to recover holy living. He taught believers to "avoid even the most subtle appearances of evil, shunning fashionable clothing, cursing, drunkenness, sensuous literature, and worldly music, not to mention murder, adultery, lying, and thieving."<sup>[7]</sup> Out of the Wesleyan movement came the "Holiness" denominations. Allen and Hughes capture the Wesleyan movement's aim: "Daniel S. Warner [1842-1925] and his Church of God (Anderson, Indiana, 1880) is a notable case in point. Warner rejected the denomination pattern out of hand and summoned the true sheep of God out of their denominational structures and into 'the only holy church of the Bible.'"<sup>[8]</sup>

In order to understand the restoration heritage within the Churches of Christ, one must unearth the original intent of the early reformers. The movement initiated by the Campbells (Thomas [1763-1854] and Alexander [1788-1866] and Barton Stone [1772-1844] was to restore unity "among Christians within the various sects." Their crusade was to revitalize fellowship upon the belief that Jesus is the Christ, not creeds. Their theme was "unity in freedom rather than a unity in conformity; in other words, their motif was "unity in diversity."<sup>[9]</sup> In the first issue of *The Christian Baptist*, Campbell writes:

The societies called churches, constituted and set in order by those ministers of the New Testament, were of such as received and acknowledged Jesus as Lord Messiah, the Saviour of the World, and had put themselves under his guidance. The ONLY BOND OF UNION among them was faith in him and submission to his will. No subscription to abstract propositions framed by synods; no decrees of councils sanctioned by kings; no rules of practice commanded by ecclesiastical courts were imposed on them as terms of admission into, or of continuance in, this holy brotherhood.<sup>[10]</sup>

But second generation disciples changed the "unity in diversity" to "unity in conformity." As a result of this change of philosophy, "loyal churches" appeared everywhere. Out of this movement originated the "one-cup" and "non-Sunday-school" fellowships. Various brotherhoods within the Churches of Christ multiplied—one on every corner. No conformity, no unity was the battle cry. An example of this type mentality is advanced by a one-cup and non-Sunday school journal (*The Light*): "Where the Bible is silent, we are silent."<sup>[11]</sup> Out of this religious philosophy came the divisions that now exist within the Christian community. This essay is concerned with one of the "odd" movements that came out of the Stone-Campbell reformation movement—one-cup and non-Sunday school. This paper is not an analysis of the rightness or wrongness of arguments presented by Christians for or against Sunday school or individual communion cups in the observance of the Lord's Supper. Its purpose is only to acquaint believers with the problems Christians face in seeking answers to one's faithfulness to God. Before one embarks upon the history of the one-cup controversy, this paper begins with a brief history of the modern-day Sunday school.

## EARLY HISTORY OF THE SUNDAY SCHOOL CONTROVERSY

The modern-day Sunday school had its beginning in 1780 under the leadership of Robert Raikes (1735-1811) of Gloucester, England.[\[12\]](#) Though many accepted this innovation, it was not without its opponents. In 1798, Thomas Burns preached two sermons against the introduction of the procedure into Scotland.[\[13\]](#) William Pitt (1708-1778) thought seriously of proposing a bill in Parliament for the purpose of restraining Sunday-schools.[\[14\]](#)

### Early Trailblazers

The early trailblazers in the Restoration Movement resisted Sunday schools. But their protest concerned the abuse of the system rather than the system itself. During the early days of Alexander Campbell's ministry, he objected to the mis-use of Missionary Societies, Sunday schools and other hobbies, as these institutions are sometimes referred to, of modern times rather than an indictment of them. He explains:

Their churches were not fractured into missionary societies, Bible societies, and education societies; nor did they dream of organizing such in the world. The head of a believing household was not in those days a president or manager of a board of foreign missions; his wife, the president or manager of a board of foreign missions; his wife, the president of some female education society; his eldest son, the recording secretary of some domestic bible society; his eldest daughter, the corresponding secretary of a mite society; his servant maid, the vice-president of a rag society; and his little daughter, a tutoress of a Sunday School. They knew nothing of the hobbies of modern times. In their Church capacity alone they moved.[\[15\]](#)

In this same vein, Campbell continues to express his disapproval of the Sunday schools as a means of propagating the ranks of sects:

The Bible cannot be disseminated without their appendages; and if children are taught to read in a Sunday school, their pockets must be filled with religious tracts, the object of which is either directly or indirectly to bring them under the domination of some creed or sect. Even the distribution of the bible to the poor must be followed up with those tracts, as if the bible dare not be trusted in the hands of a layman, without a priest or his representative at his elbow. It is on this account that I have, for sometime, viewed both "Bible Societies" and "Sunday Schools" as a sort of recruiting establishments to fill up the ranks of those sects which take the lead in them.[\[16\]](#)

Nevertheless, in spite of these negative statements, twenty-three years later (1847), his views altered considerably concerning its desirability. He argues:

Next to the Bible Society, the Sunday School institution stands preeminently deserving the attention of co-operation of all good men; for without the people can read the Bible, of what use is the multiplication and diffusion of the Divine volume! I never had but one objection to the administration of the system—never one to the system itself. That objection was simply to the sectarian abuse whenever any bias was given presented as premiums, but which it seems to me

that there was an unfair advantage taken in making an institution peculiarly catholic, sectarian, and partial.[\[17\]](#)

Although Barton Stone (1772-1844) objected to Sunday school as an institution,[\[18\]](#) he did not object to the teaching of children in classes. He penned:

Let us not neglect to meet together every Lord's day for worship. Should you have no preacher, meet and read the scriptures, sing, pray and exhort one another. Let a part of the day be devoted to the instruction of our children in the scriptures. Choose one or more pious and intelligent men, who shall preside over the class of children: let them previously assign the portion of scripture to be read, and labor to make them understand it. This will be found profitable and pleasant.[\[19\]](#)

In 1834 John T. Johnson (1788-1856) narrated the events surrounding the establishment of a Sunday school in Georgetown, Kentucky:

On the first Lord's day of February the Brethren and Sisters in and near Georgetown met at their place of worship and determined from that time forward to commence committing to memory the oracles of Heaven. The following organization then succeeded. The sisters were divided into two classes; and to each of these classes was assigned the duty of superintending a class of girls allotted to each. . . . The same course was adopted in reference to the Brethren and the youth committed to their charge.[\[20\]](#)

### *Early Opposition*

Even though many churches adopted Sunday school, nevertheless there were many that did not.[\[21\]](#) "Some disciples, however, opposed it because it was not mentioned specifically in the Bible."[\[22\]](#) Steven Eckstein surveys the history of this controversy under the caption "Minor Issues";[\[23\]](#) He writes that

In Texas, the first dispute over the Sunday school occurred in 1875. Minister G. W. Harvey of the Concord church, Austin County, labeled the Sunday school as a device to "attract little children, keep them from the prairie on Lord's day running mule eared rabbits, riding jacks and doing mischief generally. In reply to Harvey's question for "a catechism" with which to raise children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, Lipscomb thoughtfully suggested that a well conducted Sunday School for both old and young is a "true method" of teaching on Lord's day.[\[24\]](#) But McGary retorted that the admonition for parents to teach the Bible to their children laid no foundation for Sunday school. "Away with Sunday Schools, even if Bro. Lipscomb had memorized the whole New Testament at Sunday school." If the apostles did not have Sunday Schools, he continued, we do not need them and should not have them.[\[25\]](#) Later, however, McGary evidently had changed his mind as he contended that literature prepared "in the light of God's truth and in harmony with it, adapted to unfolding the tender mind of children, cannot be condemned."[\[26\]](#) [\[27\]](#)

There were many others who opposed the so-called innovations. One of the first and perhaps

the most vocal against Sunday school and individual communion cups was Dr. George Averill Trott (1855-1930).[\[28\]](#) Dr. Trott became one of the editors of the ***Firm Foundation*** along

with Nimrod Lafayette Clark (1870-?). Clark also condemned Sunday school as an innovation. In 1906, Clark and R. L. Whiteside exchanged articles on the subject.[\[29\]](#) As early as 1897 some were willing to draw the line of fellowship over instrumental music, societies, and rebaptism[\[30\]](#), but the dividing line over Sunday school did not occur until 1918. Ervin Water (b. 1918) asserts that N. L. Clark is the father of the non-class movement:

It was not until 1918 that our people began to draw lines over the Sunday school question. N. L. Clark was the father of the non-class movement in Texas. Even though he debated the subject with men like G. H. P. Showalter and R. L. Whiteside, he never made it a test of fellowship. He even served with brother Showalter as co-editor of the Firm Foundation back in those days. But others began to draw lines and create parties, so that the division was well crystallized by the time I began to preach in 1935.[\[31\]](#)

In 1910, J. T. Showalter wrote an essay about Sunday school for the ***Gospel Advocate***. In this article he repudiated the scripturalness of the practice:

Whenever any man proves the Sunday school to be of divine authority, he can prove missionary societies to be of divine authority. By all rules of logic, he that "would the one retain, must to the other cling." I emphatically deny that there is any divine authority for Sunday-schools either by precept or precedent, hint or allusion. . . . In all the writings of the New Testament there is not one word that even squints in that direction. Not a word is said about a Sunday-school superintendent, a Sunday-school teacher, Sunday-school scholars or anything of that kind.[\[32\]](#)

Another figure that played a very important role in the non-Sunday-school movement was Clarence Teurman (1884-1923),[\[33\]](#) who later became publisher (1916) of the ***Apostolic Way*** (1913-?). Following the death of Teurman, R. F. Duckworth succeeded him as publisher (1925). In the beginning, "Duckworth was wholeheartedly opposed to Sunday-schools as well as a plurality of cups."[\[34\]](#) The editorial staff consisted of the following men: G. A. Trott, H. C. Harper, N. L. Clark, and R. F. Duckworth. Also, Trott and Harper both opposed Sunday-schools as well as a plurality of cups.[\[35\]](#)

As a result of Duckworth's later views concerning these two issues, a new paper was initiated by H. C. Harper (1874-1936) called ***The Truth*** (1928-1931). Soon after the beginning of ***The Truth***, Harper invited J. D. Phillips (1904-1981) to join him in the editorial responsibilities. Dough Phillips was converted under the preaching of Homer L. King (1892-1983), who also became a part of the editorial staff (1930).[\[36\]](#) In 1929, Harper approached Phillips about taking over the publication of ***The Truth***. But the transition was not made until 1931. At this time Phillips and King assumed equal ownership of the paper. The name was changed to ***Old Paths Advocate***, which is still published. With the first issue of the paper another name was added to the editorial masthead, Homer A. Gay (1894-1958).[\[37\]](#)

## THE DILEMMA OF THE ONE-CUP MOVEMENT

The following documented account of the one-cup and non-Sunday school heritage is not to impugn the godly motives of so many who advocated (advocates) these views in their endeavor to be true to what they understood (understand) the Word of God to teach. One cannot help but reflect upon the words of Paul in Romans when one contemplates upon the sincere efforts of so-many who have gone to be with Jesus.[\[38\]](#) In 1982, Don McCord commented on the passing of several defenders of the faith—men that sought to do what God wanted them to do. Some of these men I knew personally. It is appropriate that we remember the names of such valiant soldiers of the cross who preached Jesus (The men listed below were all members of the one-cup and non-Sunday school movement). McCord writes:

I rejoice to see the names of men that many of the readers of the *Old Paths Advocate* would recognize in the writings of H. C. Harper, Dr. G. A. Trott, Homer King, Homer A. Gay, James R. Stewart; D. F. Nichols, whose grandsons, Paul, Richard, Nelson are known among us, as well as great grandsons, the Middicks; Oscar Brannon, uncle by marriage to C. A. Smith and this writer's wife; Bro. F. K. Reeves of Marion, La., whose kin are still strong for the faith; Bro. L. G. Park, whose children and grandchildren are still in the church, and counted for years among the writer's dear, true friends; Bro. John L. Reynolds, who, for so long labored in the gospel in California; Bro. Sam L. Schulz whose late widow and daughter for years have been faithful servants; Bro. W. H. Reynolds, whose descendants are still numbered among the most faithful in south Alabama; Bro. Thomas J. Shaw, of Pa., whose sons Tommy, Jimmy and Paul are known by many of us; S. M. Prince, among whose faithful children and grandchildren it is my privilege, as I try to writ this, to work with in a meeting at Napoleon, Ala., where his works abundantly follow on; Bro. Charles H. Lechner, whose children and grandchildren still honor his name in southern and central Calif., Bro. Burley F. Black; Bro. C. H. James, maternal grandfather of Ron Willis, our preaching brother. . . . In my musings, it would be this writer's conclusion, that the saddest issue was July 16, 1928, in which it chronicles the tragic death of one of the editors, Bro. Clarence Teurman, who met his death by fire while printing the paper. The message of condolence bear familiar names; among them, G. A. Trott; H. C. Harper and wife, Ruth; N. L. Clark, Sam L. Schultz; G. H. P. Showalter; W. Guy Ashley; and Elbert D. Miller, father to E. H. Miller, and grandfather to the preachers Bailey.[\[39\]](#)

With such a host of names, one still cannot help but reflect upon so many divisions within this movement of so many equally godly men. This movement is shattered into many parts, each of which claims to "speak where the Bible speaks" and to "be silent where the Bible is silent." Consider, for example, the utter helplessness of this so-called "loyal church" movement to maintain any semblance of unity—even with the one-cup and non-Sunday school philosophy:

### **Bread-Breakers Versus the Bread-Pinchers**

1. One-cup, grape juice only, **bread-pinchers** (bread must remain one piece) and non-Sunday school[\[40\]](#)
2. One-cup, grape juice only, **bread-breakers**, non-Sunday school.

The only difference between one and two is the issue of whether to break the bread into two

or more pieces. In other words, can the bread be broken into two or more pieces or must the bread be left whole (one piece) by simply pinching a piece of bread? The "bread-breaking" body will not fellowship the "bread-pinching" party nor will the "bread-pinching" party fellowship the "bread-breaking" party. The "bread-breakers" and the "bread-pinchers" will not fellowship one another—even though both factions employ "one-cup" in the distribution of the fruit of the vine. But, this is not all of their problems. There is the "grape juice only" church and there is the "wine only" church:

### **Wine Only Versus Grape Juice Only**

1. One-cup, **wine only**, bread-pinchers, non-Sunday school
2. One-cup, **grape juice** only, break pinchers, non-Sunday school

The "grape juice only" family will not fellowship the "wine only" family. On the other hand, the "wine only" party will not fellowship the "grape juice only" party. In all of this division over how to interpret the Scriptures, no one seems to be able to arrive at a peaceable solution concerning these issues, even though all "speak where the Bible speaks." Next, there is the "no exception" association of believers that will not brotherhood the "exception" compact:

### **Divorce Exception Versus No Divorce Exception**

1. One-cup, grape juice only, bread-pinchers, non-Sunday school, **divorce exception** (Matthew 19:9.[\[41\]](#))
2. One-cup, grape juice only, bread-pinchers, non-Sunday school, **no divorce exception** (Matthew 19:9).

The only difference between the above two groups (5 and 6) is the acceptance or denial of Matthew's exception clause: "except it be for fornication." Many within the "no-exception" church will not fellowship those within the "exception" church. But the "exception" party is willing to accept the "no-exception" party. Again, another division is over fellowship. One group refuses togetherness with another group because one group fraternize brethren who do not recognize the arguments in favor of the "one-cup, grape juice only, bread-pinchers, and non-Sunday school.

### **Fellowshipping Versus Non-Fellowshipping**

1. One-cup, grape juice only, break-pinchers, non-Sunday school, **no fellowshipping other Christians**, unless they are willing to ostracize those that differ with themselves.[\[42\]](#)
2. One-cup, grape juice only, bread-pinchers, non-Sunday school, **fellowshipping other Christians** inspite of departures in understanding from the so-called orthodox party line.[\[43\]](#)

The only major difference between these two factions (7 and 8) relates to fellowship. If anyone extends fellowship to individuals who participate in the Lord's supper with the use of individual cups, fermented grape juice (wine), breaking the bread in pieces (not leaving the loaf in one unbroken piece), and so on, then, that person is thrown out of the so-called "loyal" church. To express fellowship with individuals who do not possess absolute knowledge is tantamount to having fellowship with those who do not "abide in the doctrine

of Christ" ([2 John 9](#)). What are the answers to the above positions that so many equally godly men propose as the Word of God? May the words of Paul to the Corinthians admonish all believers to make allowances for others of a different mind-set. The answer to imperfection in knowledge is found in Paul's letter to Corinth:

We know that we all possess knowledge. Knowledge puffs up, but love builds up. The man who thinks he knows something does not yet know as he ought to know. But the man who loves God is known by God ([I Corinthians 8:1b-3](#)).

## ONE-CUP CHURCHES AND PATTERN THEOLOGY

Many Christians are not acquainted with the "one-cup" movement within the Churches of Christ. Nevertheless, there is still a large segment within the Churches of Christ that does not accept the use of individual communion cups in the observance of the Lord's Supper and that also object to the class method of teaching Christians when they assemble for the so-called "worship service." These convictions are based on the philosophy of "pattern theology."[\[44\]](#) Ronny Wade, assistant publisher of *Old Paths Advocate*[\[45\]](#) sets forth the central premise concerning the use of "one-cup" and "non-Sunday school" persuasion. He sets forth his authority for such a position by citing [Hebrews 8:5](#) to justify his "pattern theology" concerning a worship service. He writes: "If Moses was commanded by God to 'to make all things according to the pattern' Hebrews 8:5 are not we bound by the same obligation (sic)? Either there is a pattern for the observance of the communion or there is none."[\[46\]](#) Wade's recall of the *Old Paths Advocate* beginning is quite revealing concerning its purpose in 1928:

This journal was started by Brother H. C. Harper in 1928. At that time the controversy over individual cups in the communion was still rather young. The introduction of the Sunday school was still a problem of great concern. Every month, the columns of this paper were filled with articles opposing these and all other innovations. Debates were common, and those guilty of fostering changes in the **divine pattern** were called into question time and again by various writers. Over time the sharpness of the controversy dulled. . . . Today, some of those same issues are surfacing again, with renewed vigor. . . . What does this all mean to readers of *Old Paths Advocate*? Simply stated, It means that we are going to have to fight all over again the battles of the past.[\[47\]](#) (Emphasis mine—RDB).

The primary objective of the *OPA* (1997), so it seems, is still to promote the so-called concept of "pattern theology" as interpreted by the one-cup and non-Sunday school brethren. One either accepts the interpretation of their concept of what the "pattern" is, or faces dire consequences. In fact, Don L. King, publisher of *OPA*, states emphatically that one is going to hell if one participates in the use of a plurality of cups in the observance of the Lord's Supper. He puts it this way:

We are concerned with things we hear about the subject of fellowship. . . . Why do we worship with one-cup? Answer: because **we read it plainly** in Matthew 26:27: Mark 14:23; Luke 22:17, 20; 1 Corinthians 10:16; 11:25-28. Is it wrong, sinful to use more than one? Answer: yes, because more than one-cup violates the **example** given in these verses, it violates the **command** for us to do as Jesus did. . . . Listen, brethren: we believe it is wrong to use more than one-cup. **We**

**believe people are going to be lost for using more than one-cup.** Surely, we believe that! If people are not going to be lost for using more than one, then let's give up the fight and heal the division caused by those who have insisted on using more than one. . . . Individual cups are a sinful violation of the **Bible pattern**. . . . What about Bible Classes? Is it right to divide the public assembly into classes for the purpose of teaching and allow women to teach? . . . The **pattern** is always an undivided assembly with one man at a time doing the teaching.[\[48\]](#) (Emphasis mine—RDB).

Even though King says, "we read it plainly," surely, not all-plain teaching is equally plain to all, otherwise there would not be such a wide division among equally godly Christians.[\[49\]](#) Before leaving this point, however, it is necessary to bring to the attention of all readers, which includes this author, that every Christian generally has a flaw(s) in his or her hermeneutics. The flaw is that all Christians bring their presuppositions to the text when they interpret. One's goal is to study the Word of God without spectacles, but that aspiration is almost next to impossible, because none are born in a vacuum. Gordon D. Fee & Douglas Stuart, contemporary scholars, point out: "This the great flaw in our common hermeneutics. Without necessarily intending to, we bring our theological heritage, our ecclesiastical traditions, our cultural norms, or our existential concerns to the Epistles as we read them. And this results in all kinds of selectivity or 'getting around' certain texts."[\[50\]](#)

### A SUMMARIZED HISTORY OF THE COMMON CUP IN THE STONE/CAMPBELL MOVEMENT

As stated above, the use of "one common cup" in the distribution of the fruit of the vine in the observance of the Lord's Supper is no longer a well-known fact among many Christians. But there are still many congregations today that will not use individual communion cups in the celebration of the communion. Ronny Wade states their position very succinctly:

A reading of New Testament passages regarding the Lord's Supper leads one to the unavoidable conclusion that Jesus used only one cup in the original institution, and that the early churches followed that example in their observance.[\[51\]](#)

In addition to the surface Scripture citations, "one-cup" brethren rely upon secular history to substantiate their position concerning the use of "one-cup" versus "multiple cups." One is scriptural, the other is not, according to their interpretation. For example, it is a fact of history that the use of individual communion cups was introduced in a Congregational Church in Putnam Co., Ohio in 1893 by Rev. Dr. J. G. Thomas, who was both a physician and minister.[\[52\]](#) The following year he was granted a patent on his invention.[\[53\]](#) The Thomas communion Service Co. wrote to E. H. Miller,[\[54\]](#) my uncle, the following letter:

E. H. Miller

% Dr. A. R. McMullon  
809 Butternut  
Abilene, Texas

Dear Sir:

Your Letter of April 17, 1950 has been received and we are pleased to inform you that the writer's grandfather, John G. Thomas, who was both a physician and a minister invented the first individual communion outfits. The first patents were issued to him in 1894. The Market Street Presbyterian Church, of Lima, Ohio is believed (sic) to be the first church to use individual communion cups in a communion service. This also occurred in 1894. What is believed to be the original individual communion service used by this church is on display in the Allen County Historical Museum in Lima, Ohio. Under separate cover we are making shipment today of an old style pewter common cup. You may have it with our compliments.

Very truly Yours,

THOMAS COMMUNION SERVICE CO[\[55\]](#)

### *Early Opposition to Small Individual Cups*

Initially, there was opposition to the use of individual communion cups by such men as J. W. McGarvey (1829-1911) and David Lipscomb (1831-1917). McGarvey wrote in *The Christian Standard*:

I have been a member of the church for forty-three years, and it has been my good fortune to be acquainted with several of our most learned and influential minister—Alexander Campbell among them—and it seems strange to me that they did not find a necessity for the individual cups.[\[56\]](#)

Lipscomb also objected to the employment of individual communion cups. He set forth his objections in no uncertain terms:

Communion is a joint participation of two or more in one work or service. The communion of the Lord's Supper is the joint participation of the members in the loaf and in the cup. . . . This shows a communion of the many on one cup and one bread. . . . To divide the cup and bread into many parts and for each to partake of his own bread and cup destroys the idea of communion and separates them into many instead of a communion into one. It is very certain the bread and cup were not divided into many parts in the days of Jesus and the apostles, and the feeling grows up from a disposition to follow other rules than the example of the Master. When this feeling leads, it leads us away from God and his laws in reference to them. It is a great strain upon our feelings of reverence for and

loyalty to God for us to follow another leader or ruler even in matters indifferent. . . . A church must be in heart disloyal to leave an old and approved way and walk in a new and doubtful way. . . . The most earthly, sensual, and ungodly spirit is that which changes merely to be like and follow the world, to be in style. . . . What is the motive that leads to the adoption of the individual cups in the Lord's Supper? It is usually said to be for the health of the partakers. Is this true? In the church house there are hundreds of people breathing and interbreathing the atmosphere of the room, infected and impregnated with all the diseases of the body, the stomach, and the catarrhal phlegm of the nose, the mouth, the throat, the stomach, the bowels, with all the fetid effluvia from all parts of these changing and decaying bodies of all the congregation. This impregnated and poisoned atmosphere is repoisoned and breathed and interbreathed hundreds of times in the house where all are congregated; and some, while doing this, complain and find fault and change the appointments of God to avoid taking a crumb of bread or a sup of wine because others have partaken of the same. Certainly these persons are doing worse than straining out gnats and swallowing camels, and element of faith enters into all service. The Bible tells us that in doing the will of God with fidelity the blessing of God will come upon us (Psa. 84:11).

No one ever heard of an affliction coming on a child of God partaking of the memorials of his love to a lost and ruined world. The desire to change the order established by Jesus and the apostle indicates a willingness to turn from the appointments of God in order to go with the ways of the world. Such a spirit does not fit us to serve God here or to live with him in the world to come. It is safe to both bodily and spiritual health to continue in the ways in which Jesus and the apostle walked.[\[57\]](#)

Both McGarvey and Lipscomb later changed their views concerning this issue, but these two quotes illustrate the emotional fervor that existed during the early stage of this change.[\[58\]](#)

### *First Church of Christ to Use Small Individual Cups*

Which Church of Christ was the first to advocate the use of the small individual cups? In answer to this question, Ronny Wade wrote: "Brother C. E. Holt of Florence, Alabama may have been the first non-instrumental preacher to come out in favor of individual cups."[\[59\]](#) C. E. Holt explains his position:

I do not claim that this is the only scriptural way of taking the Lord's Supper, but it is as scriptural as any other way, and besides it has the advantage of being clean. We are aware that some brethren ridicule the idea that microbes can be transmitted from one to another by the common cup, yet the weight of authority is against them.[\[60\]](#)

H. C. Harper (1874-1936) reviewed the arguments made by Holt in the March 5, 1912 issue of the Firm Foundation. This paper also published a written discussion between L. J. Killion and Harper over the innovation of individual cups. The late G. C. Brewer (1884-1956) introduced the individual communion cups into the central Church of Christ at Chattanooga, Tennessee. About this same time, G. Dallas Smith (1870-1920) began to speak out for their

use. This news caused Brewer to contact both Holt and Smith, thus the three men began to openly advocate the use of individual cups. Also, since Brewer knew the influence that Lipscomb exerted in the South, he took a trip to Nashville to convince him of the scripturalness of multiple containers. But much to his chagrin, he could not convince Lipscomb to change his position. But suddenly a ray of hope came through; Lipscomb admitted to him that he was about to change his mind.[\[61\]](#)

Two months after the founding of the *Apostolic Way* (1913-1934), Dr. G. A. Trott denounced the "cups" fashion. Men such as Trott, Harper, McGarvey, and Lipscomb were vocal against individual cups. According to Wade, "Harper more than any other individual deserves the credit for leading the fight against a plurality of cups in the communion."[\[62\]](#) Trott charged: "When they know they have the truth on their side they are as brash and impetuous about debating as a mule's hind leg, but just try to get one of them to debate the Sunday school or the individual cup and they have about as much pep as a chicken dying with the limber neck."[\[63\]](#)

N. L. Clark openly defended the use of more than one. Nevertheless, he wrote a paper opposing cups on the basis that they pampered human pride, which he believed was sinful. According to Wade, he did not make the issue a test of fellowship. But on the other hand Clark said, "I cannot accept the contention that one-cup only is scriptural."[\[64\]](#) In November, Harper challenged Clark to a debate. Duckworth, publisher of *Apostolic Way*, wrote an apology for allowing these two editors to get into a brawl over this issue:

I owe the readers of the *Apostolic Way* an apology as I have allowed two of the editors to appear in its columns in open conflict. Hereafter I shall ask the editors when writing on any question to write without any reference to their disagreement with any one of the other editors.

I think Brother Clark's ideas, in regard to two of the editors discussing a question, correct. Yet I am known, by the reader of *The Way*, to be strongly opposed to the **individual cup**, practice, my sympathies have been and are with the **one-cup idea**. I say this without any intention of trying to be more than fair, yet I, at all times, endeavor to keep an open mind regarding every debatable question and have such a mind regarding the use of one or more cups, though I think I am thoroughly established against the individual cups.[\[65\]](#)

By the year 1926, Duckworth leaned toward the use of individual cups. As a result of this progressive disposition, H. C. Harper (1874-1936), one of the editors withdrew and began another paper called *The Truth* (1928-1931). Dr. Trott (1855-1930), original founder, also resigned in 1926, but he still continued as front-page writer until his death.[\[66\]](#) In the first issue of *The Truth*, Harper wrote:

As Brother Trott will be connected with us prominently as a writer according to his promise it is befitting that he be heard from at this time. He says:

I stand where I have always stood, for strict adherence to the precepts and examples of the New Testament and shall advocate that principle until I die. I love you for your work's sake and your love for the gospel.[\[67\]](#)

As a result of Trott's fight against individual cups, this antagonism against cups brought him into conflict with J. N. Cowan (1879-1941), Johnson, Clark and others. Trott offered to debate Cowan, but the debate never took place. Trott also tangles with Warlick over the Sunday-school question. Later, Harper took Trott to task over the following proposition" "A Church of Christ in its use of cups in the Communion is 'contending earnestly for faith once delivered to the saints in both doctrine and practice."[\[68\]](#) With Harper it was not an either/or proposition. In order for one to "contend for the faith," one MUST use one-cup. He offered to debate Trott, but the debate never occurred.

### ***E. H. Miller and the One-cup Movement in LaGrange, GA***

This story begins with Clarence Teurman who became editor of the *Apostolic Way* in 1916. In the early 20s, he went to LaGrange, Ga., at the invitation of the Brownings,[\[69\]](#) and established a congregation. My grandfather, Elbert D. Miller (1885-1969) was invited to hear brother Teurman.[\[70\]](#) As a result of the Brownings, Teurman established the "Non-Sunday School" congregation in the latter part of the 1920s.[\[71\]](#) This congregation became known as the Park Ave. Church of Christ. During one of Teurman's visits, he baptized my Uncle, E. H. Miller (1909-1989),[\[72\]](#) and grandmother, Fannie Williams Miller (1890-1981). Teurman was killed the following year (1923) while publishing the *Apostolic Way*. Later this congregation (Park Ave. Church of Christ) divided over the Sunday school question but did not divide over the use of a plurality of cups.[\[73\]](#) As a result of this innovation, the Murphy Ave. Church of Christ was formed—both congregations still exist.[\[74\]](#)

After Miller's final conversion to the "one-cup" theory, he took up the fight for the use of one-cup and non-Sunday school philosophy.[\[75\]](#) He debated these issues from one end of the country to the other end.[\[76\]](#) Many congregations were established as an outcome of his efforts. Also, as a result of my uncle's influence and his father's (Elbert Dallis Miller) influence, I was baptized on 9 November 1949. In 1950, I moved to LaGrange, GA., and delivered my first sermon (January 1951) at the Murphy Ave. Church of Christ under the tutelage of my uncle.[\[77\]](#) The following year (1952), I moved back to Montgomery, AL and started a congregation of the one-cup and non-Sunday school persuasion with the assistance of my mother—Thelma Haygood, b. 1913, and my stepfather, Teddy Haygood (1904-1978).[\[78\]](#)

## **CONCLUSION**

We cannot escape tradition and its effects upon us. We can deny it, but we cannot escape it. We are all caught up in a web of traditions. . . . We inherit not only the Bible itself but also a traditional way of reading it. From our parents, from the preachers we admire, from Sunday School teachers, from the books and magazines we read, we receive a certain way of reading the Bible. We are part of a tradition of interpretation.[\[79\]](#)

The above citation draws attention to the fact that no one can totally escape his or her religious heritage. This essay is not designed to prove or disprove the one-cup and Sunday school positions, but only to give a brief history of this movement to indicate the dilemma that many Christians find themselves in. I have sought to write this paper as objectively as possible. But since I am so closely associated with this "one-cup and non-Sunday school movement," it is almost impossible to remove myself completely; nevertheless, I have sought

to be objective in presenting a brief overview of the history behind this particular movement.

As a result of my studies in the early 1970s, I became convinced that the one-cup movement had/has misinterpreted the Eucharistic sayings as well as the Sunday school issue. Thus, because of this change in my attitude toward the use of a plurality of cups and Bible study on Sunday morning, I accepted other believers among the cups and Sunday school brethren. When the congregation (Vonora Ave. Church of Christ[\[80\]](#)) accepted brother M. S. Whitehead, formerly a member of the Chisholm Church of Christ (cups and classes), into the fellowship of the saints, then, I was disenfranchised by the congregations of the "one-cup" belief. With many of these Christians, one was not allowed to remain in fellowship with the "one-cup" believers unless one knew beyond the shadow of a doubt that one would be lost if one participated in the use of individual cups in the distribution of the fruit of the vine.

Why study the past? What difference does it make in our relationship with one another? Why am I writing about this one-cup and non-Sunday school history? In response to these questions, I call attention to David Steinmetz who captures the necessity of studying the past very pungently:

As long as we accept uncritically what we have received from the past, we put ourselves unreservedly in its power. Tradition can obscure as well as clarify the gospel. The study of church history gives us freedom vis-à-vis the past, freedom to appropriate the riches of the church's past wisdom, when we can, and to overcome its faithlessness and sin, when we must. . . . The church could, I suppose, lose its memory as well. It is certainly tempted to do that often enough. But a church which has lost its memory of the past can only wander about aimlessly in the present and despair of its future. The church needs the past, if only for the sake of the present and the future.[\[81\]](#)

---

#### ENDNOTES

[\[1\]](#) Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Vindication of Tradition* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985), 60.

[\[2\]](#) The one-cup crusade is divided several times within its own ranks. Not one of the various factions within this bizarre movement can agree on this now famous cliché. This affirmation of loyalty to God by the one-cup faction is not unique for this fuzzy division, but also for the approximately twenty-five or more splits within the churches of Christ in general. Many Churches of Christ are aware of the many inconsistencies within its own movement and is now seeking to rephrase this cliché.

[\[3\]](#) Leroy Garrett, *The Stone-Campbell Movement*, revised edition (Joplin, Missouri: College press, 1994), 437, writes:

#### One-cup Churches of Christ

Since it is fractured five ways, this cluster of churches is the most difficult to identify. The main group may have as many as 30,000 members in upwards of 530 churches, most of

which have 30--60 members. Homer King, Stockton, Ca., now deceased was the old editor bishop, and his *Old Paths Advocate*, which began in 1928, has long been what the old-timers call "the Standard." It is now edited in Lebanon, Mo., by his son, Don King. There is also *The Christian Expositor*, a quarterly, edited by Smith Bibbins, in Buffalo, Mo.

[4] I had the opportunity to hear Homer King, Homer Gay, and Doug Phillips, the original editors of the *Old Paths Advocate*. Also, one of the first generation advocates of this "one-cup" movement, Clarence Teurman, baptized my uncle, E.H. Miller, who later became one of the foremost debaters and defenders of the "one-cup" and non-Sunday school movement.

[5] This now famous motto is not unique just to the "one-cup party"; every division within the Stone/Campbell movement advocates this motto.

[6] C. Leonard Allen and Richard T. Hughes, *Discovering Our Roots: The Ancestry of Churches of Christ* (ACU Press: Texas, 1988), 115.

[7] Ibid., 138.

[8] Ibid., 143.

[9] Ibid., 105.

[10] Alexander Campbell, "The Christian Religion," *The Christian Baptist* 1 (4 July 1823): 14.

[11] Jerry Johnson, "The Local Church," *The Light* 27, no. 1 (January 1996): 9 where Johnson says:

The silence of the Scriptures is vital to the application of this study. Are we permitted to do that which is not specifically forbidden, such as allowing other communion services or other treasures (however temporary) outside the local church? "Where the bible is silent, we are silent." Rather than being *permissive*, Biblical silence is restrictive. This is essentially the same logic we use of the cups issue. The Book never states, "Thou shalt not use individual cups," yet we are restricted to doing only what the Book clearly illustrates.

[12] Ronny F. Wade, *The Sun Will Shine Again Someday* (Springfield, Missouri: Yesterday's Treasures, 1986), 24. See also Stephen Daniel Eckstein Jr., *History of the Churches of Christ in Texas 1824-1950* (Texas: Firm Foundation, 1963), 262.

[13] Ibid., 25.

[14] Ibid.

[15] Alexander Campbell, "The Christian Religion," *The Christian Baptist* 1 (January 1827): 14.

[16] Alexander Campbell, "Prefatory Remarks," *The Christian Baptist* 2 (2 August 1824): 5.

[17] Alexander Campbell, "Reply to Elder A. W. Corey," *The Millennial Harbinger* IV (April 1847): 200.

[18] See Wade, *The Sun Will Shine Again Someday*, 28.

[19] Barton Stone, "An Address," *The Christian Messenger* 2 (January 1828): 72.

[20] J. T. Johnson, "Christian School," *Christian Messenger* VIII (February 1834): 62. .

[21] See Larry Hart, "A Brief History of a Minor Restorationist Group ( The Non-Sunday-School Churches of Christ)" *Restoration Quarterly* 22, no 4 (Fourth Quarter 1979): 211-232 for an excellent overview of this movement.

[22] Eckstein, *History of the Churches of Christ In Texas*, 262.

[23] Ibid.

[24] G. W. Harvey, "Church News," *Gospel Advocate*, XVII (June 3, 1875), pp 535-537.

[25] *Firm Foundation*, January 15, 1888.

[26] Ibid., May 23, 1899.

[27] Eckstein, *History of the Churches of Christ in Texas*, 264.

[28] Wade, *The Sun Will Shine Again, Someday*, 30.

[29] Ibid., 34-35.

[30] Ibid.

[31] Ervin Water, "The Odyssey of Division," *Restoration Review* XII (March 1971): 39.

[32] J. T. Showalter, "The Sunday School," in *Gospel Advocate* (21 April 1910): 488.

[33] In 1922, Clarence Teurman baptized E. H. Miller (my uncle) and Miller's mother, Fannie Miller (my grandmother). Brother Teurman died as a result of a fire while working on the July 1 issue of his paper. At the time of his death, brother J. A. Dennis was with him. J. A. Dennis baptized my mother (Thelma Haygood) and my aunt (Katherine Hammer, b. 1911). My grandfather (Elbert Dallis Miller) wrote in the *Apostolic Way*: "Brother Teurman's death was the greatest shock that myself and family ever received." During the ministry of Teurman, Dennis purchased a car for Teurman to help him in his evangelistic tours, although Dennis could not afford one for himself and his family. My mother related some of this information to me and the other data is found in Wade's book: *The Sun Will Shine Again, Someday*, 41.

[34] Wade, *The Sun Will Shine Again, Someday*, 70.

[35] Ibid., 70.

[36] Ibid., 89-90.

[37] Ibid., 104-106. As a young preacher boy, I met and heard the original editors--J. D. Phillips, Homer L. King, and Homer A. Gay--of the *Old Paths Advocate* preach the gospel of Jesus.

[38] In Romans, chapters 14 and 15, Paul sets forth principles for Christian unity when believers do not see "eye to eye" on every doctrinal issue. He wrote forcefully and to the point: "Who are you to judge someone else's servant? To his own master he stands or falls. And he will stand, for the Lord is able to make him stand" (Romans 14:4).

[39] Don McCord, "Perusings and Musings," *Old Paths Advocate* LIV (September, 1982): 1, 6.

[40] See Bennie T. Cryer, "Not Discerning the Lord's Body," *Old Paths Advocate* LVII (August 1985), 1. He writes:

**ONE UNDIVIDED LOAF STANDS FOR THAT ONE BODY:** Because of this fact Christ chose to use only one loaf and keep it in one unit. Each member that shared this loaf was declaring his oneness with all the other members of that community of Christians. 1 Cor. 10:16-17.

See also Edward Williamson, "A Reply to Bro. C. W. Mickey, *Old Paths Advocate* LVII (August 1985): 7. Williamson replies to Mickey's arguments concerning the breaking of bread:

In the May through August, 1985 issues of the "*Reasoner*," I read an article written by Bro. C. W. Mickey entitled "Blind, He Leads The Blind." This article was an attempt by Bro Mickey to justify the breaking of the communion loaf before it is passed to the congregation. Earlier this year I engaged Bro. Mickey in written discussion, but I feel that the article he wrote needs to be reviewed since there is much untruth contained in it. We are in agreement with him on what he states in his first paragraph that Jesus took only one loaf when He instituted the Lord's Supper. However, from this point on we have many differences. . . . That one body (the loaf) is whole when we partake of it to symbolize the one body of Christ, not shattered into pieces as Bro. Mickey teaches.

[41] See Ronny F. Wade, "The Light--A Response," *Old Paths Advocate* LVI (July 1984): 4. He writes about "two neatly wrapped bundles":

Bro. Jerry Johnson's attempt to divide us into two neatly wrapped bundles "the pros" and "the cons" may make good copy, but it is neither true nor practical. (*The Light*, March 1984).

The fact that the *Old Paths Advocate* has published a number of articles recently on these subjects is very disturbing to "*The Light*." That should come as no

surprise to anyone. For several years, through its pages, the "no exception" view has been heralded long and loud. Since this is basically why the paper came into existence in the first place. I for one, believe they have every right to publish their views. By the same token the *Old Paths Advocate* has the right to publish articles in defense of the application of Mt. 19:9 to Christians today.

[42] See Alan Bonifay, "Has Brother J. Ervin Waters Returned?", *Christian's Expositor Extra*, VI (April 1996): 7, for an example of this philosophy about fellowship among those who do not concur with the status quo of the party that everything doctrinally correct, that is, according to their interpretation, which is the same as God's Word (?). Bonifay expresses the concerns of the "one-cup" brethren when he writes:

**The Problem:** The issue is not whether or not Bro. Waters' confessions should be received. They certainly should be accepted at face value. They are to be applauded and received with thanksgiving. The issue is not whether or not Bro. Waters intends to personally call on digressives. Reportedly he has said he will no longer do this. For this too, we give God thanks.

The issue is over Bro. Waters' view of fellowship and his practice of extending it to congregations and brethren who are not in the fellowship of our Lord. When Bro. Waters recants his position expressed above and when he demonstrates by his behavior that his position has come in line with the truth and in line with Jesus then he will be received without question. Until then he will not. For now we will follow Bro. Waters only advice and judge him by his fruits (Mt. 7:15-20).

See also Clovis T. Cook, "Setting the Record Straight," *Old Paths Advocate* LXX (May 1996): 4, where he writes:

Since we have approximately five hundred congregations in the United States, it is our firm belief that the most of the congregations would not agree that they could use cups and class or wine brethren in their public worship services. It creates a stumbling block on our way to full unity and fellowship in the body of Christ. . . . I think that it goes without saying, that the confession and statement that has been made by Bro. Waters should be accepted. . . . His practice of fellowshipping and "bidding God-speed" to a few congregations who have stepped across the line and have definitely become a "congregation on the other side" who exist because of division, or who retain in their fellowship a person or persons who are living in defiance of God's moral law, or who maintains a very loose and lax control over them that labor among us. We have asked our dear brother to cease this practice, clearing the way for full fellowship, peace, unity and harmony, as we hand in yesteryear.

[43] Ibid., again, Bonifay expresses his concern over Water's position of fellowship:

Today, Bro. Waters continues to worship with the congregation at 15<sup>th</sup> and "I" in Temple, Texas, which has a long standing practice of calling on various sorts of digressives, including , but not limited to John Staley, Karl (sic) Ketcherside,

and Olan Hicks. When questioned recently about their practice and urged to change it, one of the brethren reportedly stated they (the Temple congregation) had no intention of changing either their view or their practice.

[44] The expression "pattern theology" is a belief that God has prescribe five (5) acts or rituals to be performed in a prescribed manner on Sunday morning when Christians gather to encourage one another in the faith. These five acts must be observed in a certain order for worship to be "in spirit and truth," so it is advocated by many. The debate is not over whether the word "pattern" is a valid word, which it is, for the life of the believer, but whether or not God has ordained certain rituals to be engaged in on Sunday morning in a particular manner for worship to be "real," that is to say, according to the pattern, or New Testament blue-print.

[45] The *Old Paths Advocate (OPA)* began publication in 1932, but prior to this date, the paper was published under the name *The Truth* (1928-1931), edited by H. C. Harper, who formerly was one of three editors for the *Apostolic Way* (1913-?). The *OPA* is still the chief magazine for the "one-cup," "grape juice only," "bread-pinching" (that is, the bread must remain whole--must not be broken into more than one piece), "non-Sunday school," and "non-fellowshipping" (that is to say, anyone who disagrees with the doctrinal party beliefs). See Ronny F. Wade, *The Sun Will Shine Again, Someday* (Yesterday's Treasures: Missouri, 1986, 2, 74, as an example of the exclusive nature of this fellowship.

[46] Ibid., 1.

[47] Ronny F. Wade, "Looking Back to the Future," *Old Paths Advocate* LXVII (January 1995): 1.

[48] Don L. King, "Proper Perspective," editorial, *Old Paths Advocate* LXVII (September 1995): 2.

[49] This group, as stated above, is divided over many issues: (1) whether to use "grape juice," or "wine" in the observance of the Lord's Supper, (2) the manner of breaking the bread (one pinches the bread while the other breaks the bread into pieces), (3) the acceptance of the "exception clause" in Matthew 5:32 and Matthew 19:9, while others deny that this clause is valid in the Christian dispensation, (4) the order of worship as recorded in Acts 2:42, and (5 ) the question of fellowship (Some Christians in this fellowship will not draw a line of demarcation against other believers that disagree with the above doctrinal matters).

[50] Gordon D. Fee & Douglas Stuart, *How to Read the Bible for All Its Worth*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1993), 62.

[51] Wade, *The Sun Will Shine Again, Someday*, 53.

[52] History substantiates the pattern of "individual cups" in 1893. But does this mean that people prior to this date did not employ more than one-cup in the distribution of the fruit of the vine? No. It was not uncommon for churches to use two or more cups in Communion,. In fact, during the observance of the Passover, in the time of Christ, each person had his own cup. Thus, one may properly speak of individual cups utilized in the Passover celebration. But, it is true that the "small" individual cups, as adopted by churches today, did not exist

until 1893. There is a little sophistry employed on the part of the "one-cup" brethren about individual cups, though not deliberately. Only part of the story is told, not the whole story.

[53] Wade, *The Sun Will Shine Again, Someday*, 60.

[54] Letter dated: April 22, 1950.

[55] A photographic copy of this letter is in the Dallas Burdette's collection of books in Southern Christian University, 1200 Taylor Rd., Montgomery, AL 36117, phone 334-277-2277. This copy was given to Dallas Burdette by his uncle, E. H. Miller.

[56] J. W. McGarvey, "Biblical Criticism," *Christian Standard* (26 February 1910); (9) 353.

[57] David Lipscomb, "Individual Communion," *Gospel Advocate* (May 22, 1913): 488. Also, cited in Miller, *Individual Communion Cups and the Cup of the Lord* (nd), 5, 6.

[58] Wade, *The Sun Will Shine Again, Someday*, 65.

[59] Ibid.

[60] C. D. Holt, *Gospel Advocate* (11 July 1911); quoted in Wade, *The Sun Will Shine Again, Someday*, 65. I checked the microfilm files for this citation listed by Wade, But I could not locate the citation as listed (RDB).

[61] Wade, *The Sun Will Shine Again, Someday*, 66. I am indebted to Wade for this information. I do not have access to the above journals that he cites from.

[62] Ibid., 68. See also Lynwood Smith, "Brother H. C. Harper," *Old Paths Advocate* LIV (January 1982): 8, for an interesting note of history about Harper. Smith writes:

Harry Charles Harper was born October 24, 1874, at Schannahon, Illinois. He was the son of staunch Christian parents. David Harper and Eliza (Newcomer) Harper . . . His father was baptized by Alexander Campbell, so we know that he had a close link with the great Restoration Movement, a fact that seemed evident in his life always. At age nineteen, December 19, 1892, he was baptized into Christ and began preaching at the evening services.

[63] G. A. Trott, "Cup or Cups?," *Apostolic Way*, vol., 2, no. 14 (1 July 1925): 1; I am indebted to Ronny Wade for this reference, but his citation is not same as cited directly from the journal. His citation is found in his book, *The Sun Will Rise Again, Someday*, 70: "the digressives had the truth they were as 'brash and impetuous about debating as a mule's leg,' but when you tried to get them to defend the Sunday-school and individual cups they had about as much pep as a chicken dying with the limber neck."

[64] N. L. Clark, *Apostolic Way* (15 December 1925); quoted in Wade, *The Sun Will Shine again, Someday*, 71.

[65] F. F. Duckworth, *Apostolic Way* (1 April 1928); quoted in Wade, 71-72.

[66] Ibid., 77.

[67] H. C. Harper, *The Truth* (June 1928); quoted in Wade, 77.

[68] Ibid., 83.

[69] Alton B. Bailey, "A Tribute to Brother E. H. Miller," *Old Paths Advocate* LXII (February 1990): 1. My mother, sister of E. H. Miller, also related to me the beginning of the "one-cup" movement in LaGrange, GA.

[70] My grandfather at this time was meeting with the Baptist, even though he was a member of the Church of Christ. At this particular time there was no Church of Christ in LaGrange.

[71] E. H. Miller, "Fifty Years," *Old Paths Advocate* LIV (January 1982): 20.

[72] Bailey, "A Tribute to Brother E. H. Miller," Ibid:

He (E. H. Miller) obeyed the gospel in 1922 at the hands of Bro. Clarence Teurman. He preached his first sermon June 21, 1931 under an old Oak Tree in the front yard of Bro. Browning here in LaGrange. The title of his first sermon was "The Way to Heaven" and his last in March 1986 with the title "How Far Is It To Hell,"

[73] This division occurred in 1935. See Steve Bowen, "ELBERT HARVEY MILLER," *The Informer* (November 1989): 5. Bowen is the grandson of the late E. H. Miller.

[74] Another name that is worth mentioning is J. A. Dennis. He worked with Teurman; Dennis rejected Sunday School, but he accepted the use of individual communion cups. As a young boy, I remember hearing Dennis preach in a tent revival in Montgomery, AL. Today there is still a cups but non-Sunday-school group in Montgomery. My mother, Thelma Haygood, related to me that Dennis purchased a car for Teurman so that he could travel and preach the gospel, but he could not afford a car for himself.

[75] See Steve Bowen (grandson of E. H. Miller), "Elbert Harvey Miller," part 1, in *The Informer* (November, 1989): 1-7.

[76] See Alton B. Bailey, "A Tribute to Brother E. H. Miller," *Old Paths Advocate*: 2. He writes:

**As a debater**, he debated more subjects than any one preacher that I personally know. He debated lawyers, doctors, college professors, highly educated preachers, and uneducated preachers alike. I have no idea how many different subjects he debated publicly. Some of the subjects that I can recall were the Sunday School, Individual cups, The God Head, The Oneness, The Miraculous works of God, The Name, The new Birth, The hair and covering of 1 Cor. Chapter 11, The Marriage and divorce question, Baptism in the name of Jesus Only, Breaking of the Bread, The fermented Wine, etc.

[77] My first sermon was titled "What Should I Preach." This message presented the views of the party line--one-cup and non-Sunday school.

[78] This congregation was started in my mother's home. The original members of this congregation were Dallas Burdette, "Teddy" Haygood (my stepfather) and mother, Thelma Haygood. Eventually, this congregation grew to approximately 80 to 90 in attendance. I do not remember how many times my stepfather spoke before the congregation, but I recently found an old record where he delivered a sermon on December 30, 1956 at 6 p.m. Today there is just a handful left. As of this date (January 4, 1999), my mother still meets with this group of believers.

[79] C. Leonard Allen and Richard T. Hughes, *Discovering Our Roots* (Abilene, Texas: ACU Press, 1988), 4.

[80] The designation of this congregation was originally called the Madison Ave. Church of Christ. Later this congregation rented a building on Union St. and became known as the Union St. Church of Christ. Then, the congregation moved to a ware house, owned by my stepfather and mother, on Rotary St. and became known as the Rotary St. Church of Christ. Finally, the congregation purchased property on the corner of Upper Wetumpka Road and Vonora Avenue and became known as the Vonora Ave. Church of Christ. Today, this congregation is under the leadership of Louis Arnette, a very devout Christian brother.

[81] David C. Steinmetz, "The Necessity of the Past," *Theology Today* 33, no. 2 (July 1976): 173, 176.